

a related taxpayer for the same or another taxable year. This is one of the two circumstances in which the maintenance of an inconsistent position is not a requirement for an adjustment but the requirements in paragraph (b) of § 1.1311(b)-2 must be fulfilled (correction not barred at time of erroneous action).

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

*Example 1.* The taxpayer, A, who computes his income by use of the accrual method of accounting, deducted in his return for the taxable year 1951 an item of expense which he paid in such year. At the time A filed his return for 1951, the statute of limitations for 1950 had not expired. Subsequently, the Commissioner asserted a deficiency for 1951 based on the position that the liability for such expense should have been accrued for the taxable year 1950. In 1955, after the period of limitations on refunds for 1950 had expired, there was a determination by the Tax Court disallowing such deduction for the taxable year 1951. A is entitled to an adjustment for the taxable year 1950. However, if such liability should have been accrued for the taxable year 1946 instead of 1950, A would not be entitled to an adjustment, if a credit or refund with respect to 1946 was already barred when he deducted such expense for the taxable year 1951.

*Example 2.* The taxpayer, B, in his return for 1951 claimed a deduction for a charitable contribution. The Commissioner asserted a deficiency for such year contending that 50 percent of the deduction should be disallowed, since the contribution was made from community property 50 percent of which was attributable to B's spouse. The deficiency is sustained by the Tax Court in 1956, subsequent to the period of limitations within which B's spouse could claim a refund with respect to 1951. An adjustment is permitted to B's spouse, a related taxpayer, since a refund attributable to a deduction by her of such contribution was not barred when B claimed the deduction.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

**§ 1.1312-5 Correlative deductions and inclusions for trusts or estates and legatees, beneficiaries, or heirs.**

(a) Paragraph (5) of section 1312 applies to distributions by a trust or an estate to the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees. If the determination relates to the amount of the deduction allowed by sections 651 and 661 or the inclusion in taxable income of the beneficiary required by sections 652 and 662 (includ-

ing amounts falling within subpart D, subchapter J, chapter 1 of the Code, relating to treatment of excess distributions by trusts), or if the determination relates to the additional deduction (or inclusion) specified in section 162 (b) and (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (or the corresponding provisions of a prior revenue act), with respect to amounts paid, credited, or required to be distributed to the beneficiaries, heirs, and legatees, and such determination requires:

(1) The allowance to the estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously omitted or excluded from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(2) The inclusion of such amounts in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously disallowed to or omitted by the estate or trust; or

(3) The disallowance to an estate or trust of the deduction when such amounts have been erroneously included in the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees; or

(4) The exclusion of such amounts from the income of the beneficiaries, heirs, or legatees when the deduction has been erroneously allowed to the estate or trust.

(b) The application of paragraph (a)(1) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* For the taxable year 1954, a trustee, directed by the trust instrument to accumulate the trust income, made no distribution to the beneficiary and returned the entire income as taxable to the trust. Accordingly the beneficiary did not include the trust income in his return for the year 1954. In 1957, a State court holds invalid the clause directing accumulation and determines that the income is required to be currently distributed. It also rules that certain extraordinary dividends which the trustee in good faith allocated to corpus in 1954 were properly allocable to income. In 1958, the trustee, relying upon the court decision, files a claim for refund of the tax paid on behalf of the trust for the year 1954 and thereafter files a suit in the District Court. The claim is sustained by the court (except as to the tax on the extraordinary dividends) in 1959 after the expiration of the period of limitations upon deficiency assessments against the beneficiary for the year 1954. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the beneficiary's tax for the year 1954. The treatment of the

## § 1.1312-6

## 26 CFR Ch. I (4-1-13 Edition)

distribution to the beneficiary of the extraordinary dividends shall be determined under subpart D of subchapter J.

(c) The application of paragraph (a)(2) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* Assume the same facts as in the example in paragraph (b) of this section, except that, instead of the trustee's filing a refund claim, the Commissioner, relying upon the decision of the State court, asserts a deficiency against the beneficiary for 1954. The deficiency is sustained by final decision of the Tax Court of the United States in 1959, after the expiration of the period for filing claim for refund on behalf of the trust for 1954. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the trust for the year 1954.

(d) The application of paragraph (a)(3) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* A trustee claimed in the trust return for 1954 for amounts paid to the beneficiary a deduction to the extent of distributable net income. This amount was included by the beneficiary in gross income in his return for 1954. In computing distributable net income the trustee had included short and long-term capital gains. In 1958, the Commissioner asserts a deficiency against the trust on the ground that the capital gains were not includible in distributable net income, and that, therefore, the gains were taxable to the trust, not the beneficiary. The deficiency is sustained by a final decision of the Tax Court in 1960, after the expiration of the period for filing claims for refund by the beneficiary for 1954. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the beneficiary's tax for the year 1954, based on the exclusion from 1954 gross income of the capital gains previously considered distributed by the trust under section 662.

(e) The application of paragraph (a)(4) of this section may be illustrated by the following example:

*Example:* Assume the same facts as in the example in paragraph (d) of this section, except that, instead of the Commissioner's asserting a deficiency, the beneficiary filed a refund claim for 1954 on the same ground. The claim is sustained by the court in 1960 after the expiration of the period of limitations upon deficiency assessments against the trust for 1954. An adjustment is authorized with respect to the trust for the year 1954.

[T.D. 6500, 25 FR 12034, Nov. 26, 1960]

## § 1.1312-6 Correlative deductions and credits for certain related corporations.

(a) Paragraph (6) of section 1312 applies if the determination allows or disallows a deduction (including a credit) to a corporation, and if a correlative deduction or credit has been erroneously allowed, omitted, or disallowed in respect of a related taxpayer described in section 1313(c)(7).

(b) The application of paragraph (a) of this section may be illustrated by the following examples:

*Example 1.* X Corporation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Y Corporation. In 1955, X Corporation paid \$5,000 to Y Corporation and claimed an interest deduction for this amount in its return for 1955. Y Corporation included this amount in its gross income for 1955. In 1958, the Commissioner asserted a deficiency against X Corporation for 1955, contending that the deduction for interest paid should be disallowed on the ground that the payment was in reality the payment of a dividend to Y Corporation. X Corporation contested the deficiency, and ultimately in June 1959, a final decision of the Tax Court sustained the Commissioner. Since the amount of the payment is a dividend, Y Corporation should have been allowed for 1955 the corporate dividends-received deduction under section 243 with respect to such payment. However, the Tax Court's decision sustaining the deficiency against X Corporation occurred after the expiration of the period for filing claim for refund by Y Corporation for 1955. An adjustment is authorized with respect to Y Corporation for 1955.

*Example 2.* Assume the same facts as in example (1) except that, instead of the Commissioner asserting a deficiency against X Corporation for 1955, Y Corporation filed a claim for refund in 1958, alleging that the payment received in 1955 from X Corporation was in reality a dividend to which the corporate dividends-received deduction (section 243) applies. The Commissioner denied the claim, and ultimately in June 1959, the district court, in a final decision, sustained Y Corporation. Since the amount of the payment is a dividend, X Corporation should not have been allowed an interest deduction for the amount paid to Y Corporation. However, the district court's decision sustaining the claim for refund occurred after the expiration of the period of limitations for assessing a deficiency against X Corporation for the year 1955. An adjustment is authorized with respect to X Corporation's tax for 1955.

[T.D. 6617, 27 FR 10823, Nov. 7, 1962]